

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Bachelors of Science in Elementary Education/Special Education Dual Major

Program Description: Grand Canyon University's Bachelors of Science in Elementary/Special Education (dual major) is a degree that leads to teaching in an elementary or a cross categorical K-12 setting. It is designed for any individual who wishes to seek an elementary (grades K-8) or cross-categorical teaching certificate to teach children with special needs in the K-12 setting

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

The program review documents presented coupled with site interviews yielded a comprehensive review of all teacher education programs. The Bachelor's of Science in Elementary and Special Education is a dual major program which will allow its graduates to teach in elementary education settings (grades K-8) and in special education settings (K-12). Courses included objectives and competencies aligned with state and national standards. Benchmark assignments were clearly identified and aligned to address the state standards. Courses included field experience components that had a corresponding performance-based assessment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program review documents
- Site visit interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Alignment to national standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

Course syllabi were complete with detailed information including objectives. Syllabi were aligned with state and national standards. At times there was confusion regarding prerequisites. Course sequence was not included.

Prerequisites included unnecessary secondary classes. For example EDU 460 requires SEC 420 and SEC 430.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program review documents
- Site visit interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Align with evidence on program matrix	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

The majority of the benchmark assignments were performance based during the field experience component. However, successful attainment of the competencies was not clearly specified through the rubric weighting.

No remediation plan was available to assist in meeting the competencies.

Can one fail the benchmark assignment and pass the course?

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Provide specific guidelines for meeting competencies.

Create a system and process for remediation.

Evidence used for decision:

- Program review documents
- Site visit interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	The descriptors are clear, but the weighting of each descriptor is not given nor is there a minimum passing score attached to the assignment.

Findings of the Team:

Detailed rubrics were provided unique to each course.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Clarify the numerical value of the rubric scale and how it translates to the final grade.

Benchmark rubrics need to be aligned with the standards.

Evidence used for decision:

- Program review documents
- Site visit interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience") ARS R7-2-604	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	Number of required clock hours is clearly identified. Criteria for assessment of competency were clearly identified.
Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	Criteria for assessment of competency were clearly identified.

Findings of the Team:

Practicum Manuals were provided for the College of Education Undergraduate Program and the College of Education Graduate Program.

The practicum field experience definition was clearly aligned to the State Board field experience definition. Practicum experiences were clearly categorized by content area:

Foundations- any overview or introductory preparation concepts (minimum of 10 practicum hours)

Applications-any application of newly learned skills and concepts (minimum of 15 practicum hours)

Integrated Field Experience-a real work setting that integrates foundations and methods (minimum of 20 practicum hours).

The practicum focus as articulated in the June 16, 2008 submission was:

observation, application, reflection.

Practicum Activities and Function identified in the Practicum Manuals included:

Journal, Activity Log and Timesheet and E-portfolio.

According to the Practicum Manuals, progress in field experiences will be through formal and informal feedback from the GCU instructor.

A comprehensive Practicum Evaluation Rubric was created.

The rubric consisted of 5 criteria and 5 performance levels. Anchor statements were evident for each criteria and performance level. The criteria were:

Students select diverse practicum/internship experiences.

Students demonstrate systematic planning and organizational skills.

Students critically reflect on their practice, identify and analyze the influence of context and assumptions, and adjust accordingly.

Students perform effectively in their professional role, applying a range of approaches, keeping others motivated, engaged, and focused.

Students demonstrate effective oral and written communication.

Performance levels included:

Unsatisfactory

Developing

Competent

Above Average.

Anchor statements were tailored to the specific teacher preparation program. The Master of Education in Special Education states: "Selected settings are varied in terms of disabilities, grades, and language ability of the students. More than two of the schools are Title I schools. Experiences are done in more than two school districts."

Practicum experiences were clearly identified in the College of Education Practicum Manuals. The review team was unclear as to the relationship of the assessment of competence (benchmark assessment) and the practicum experience in some courses. For example: EED 323 states, "Spend five hours in three classrooms (15 total hours) grades 4-8. Let your mentors know that you are working on developing your lesson plan skills. Throughout the practicum, observe and interview your mentors. Two observations must be in different grade levels and one placement in a Title I school." There was not a direct link between the observations and the subsequent benchmark assessment. The only apparent alignment was the reference to the mentor teachers' practice. The practicum experience did not specify observations in a science classroom. The benchmark assignment states, "Choose a specific grade and strand from the science standards....Design six lesson plans that could be used to teach and access one particular concept from each of the science strands.... Write a 150 word reflection on why you think the plans you have devised represent best practices for teaching science and how your mentor teachers' practice influenced your design."

The practicum experiences for the programs reviewed ranged from 130 clock hours to 240 clock hours prior to the capstone experience.

Appropriate practicum placements were clearly identified in the Practicum Placement forms and in the course syllabi to ensure diversity of placements. Tracking of special education practicum placements need to ensure the range of K-6 and 7-12. Provide guidance in content placements for special education candidates.

Review table with practicum experiences identified to ensure appropriate grade-level placement in alignment with certificate.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Review placement of practicum experience requirements within the course syllabi.

Clearly link practicum experiences with benchmark assessments if practicum experiences are listed within the text of the benchmark assessment.

Consistent use of terminology in all documents: benchmark assessment vs. assessment of competence.

Evidence used for decision:

- College of Education Practicum Manuals
- Course Syllabi

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

Two evaluation documents were noted in the Practicum Manuals:

- Classroom Teacher Evaluation Feedback Form
- Practicum Evaluation Rubric.

The Classroom Teacher Evaluation Feedback Form was subjective and non-specific. The form states: "Please write a brief narrative...in the candidate's ability to become a teacher and types of activities in which the candidate was involved. " Performance was not clearly defined for the classroom teacher. Performance levels indicated Excellent, Above Average, Average, Below Average and Incomplete. The form states: Circle the rating you would give this teacher candidate..." This feedback form did not tie to State or National Standards.

The Practicum Evaluation Rubric clearly identified student behaviors and defined performance levels (Unsatisfactory, Developing, Competent, Above Average and Excelling).

The review team was unable to determine when the Practicum Evaluation Rubric would be completed and by whom and its relationship to the Assessment of Competence and grade in the course. This rubric is not tied to State or National Standards.

The review team was unable to determine the relationship between the Practicum Evaluation Rubric and the specific rubric provided for each benchmark assessment. They were also unable to determine whether the Practicum Evaluation Rubric and the Classroom Teacher Evaluation Feedback Form were included in the total points/grade for the course.

Completion of a Practicum Placement form was required for each course requiring a practicum.

The Practicum Observation Record for Teacher Candidate required the candidate to indicate Date, Time Spent (hours/minutes) and Activity.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Use of the Practicum Evaluation Rubric needs to be clearly defined for faculty and students.

Review Classroom Teacher Evaluation Feedback Form.

Review all documents for consistent terminology.

Evidence used for decision:

- College of Education Practicum Manuals
- Course Syllabi

If Unmet, further action required:

Align all evaluation forms to State and National standards.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences** and **capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Develop process to ensure that all candidates are placed with appropriately certified and highly qualified cooperating teachers.

Cross-categorical candidates must be placed in a special education setting with three of the five disability areas and a teacher certified in one or all of the disability areas.

Evidence used for decision:

- Student Teaching Manual

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

Format of Student Teaching Performance Assessment and Student Teaching Final Evaluation Form was confusing.

Although Indicators on the Student Teaching Performance Assessment were clearly identified, the scale for rating candidate performance was not aligned to the indicators. For instance, many indicators only had one- two criteria. The Likert Scale used for scoring stated: 4-All criteria met; 3 Most criteria met; 2-Some criteria Met; 1-Criterion not Met.

Alignment of Practicum Evaluation Forms and Student Teaching Performance was not evident.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Directions need to accompany Performance Assessments.

Review and revise Student Teaching Performance Assessment.

Evidence used for decision:

- Student Teaching Manual

If Unmet, further action required:

Align Student Teaching Performance Assessment and Final Evaluation Form to State and National Standards.

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
---	---	--------------------------------	--

Findings of the Team:

A graphic plan for Assessment of Applied Learning was presented for each program submitted.

Practicum experiences and TaskStream Benchmark Submissions were identified in these graphic presentations.

Gate-keeping functions were identified as Cornerstones. Four cornerstones were identified. According to the Glossary of Terms, a cornerstone is "a point in time of evaluation of student's competence to provide program reflection and candidate effectiveness."

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

If Unmet, further action required:

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ **Two (2) Year Approval**

▪ New Program

To extend to five year approval, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Coursework sequence;
- Coursework syllabi that align with State and National Standards and Indicators;
- Coursework syllabi that identify benchmark assignments with corresponding rubrics for assessing candidate's competency
- Updated program matrix that provides evidence of how state and national standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experience and assessments to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards;

One year of data related to candidates' competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessment identified in the program matrix.